

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

CHRONICLE

LITURGICA.

SINCE the last Chronicle a large number of books on liturgical subjects have appeared, and very many of them have been received for notice in the JOURNAL. I must apologize for my neglect of them hitherto.

Eastern rites have received a perhaps exceptional amount of attention.

The second part of ΧΡΥΣΟΣΤΟΜΙΚΑ: *Studi e ricerche intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo* (Rome 1908), the result of the celebration of the 1500th anniversary of the death of S. John Chrysostom, is a collection of essays on the Liturgy named after him and on the Byzantine rite generally, and it contains a mass of valuable matter otherwise not easily accessible to most of us. Dom P. de Meester discusses the Greek text of the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom in three parts. In the first part, the origin and authenticity of the liturgy is treated; and the conclusion is reached that the rite derives from the Syrian type, and may quite well belong to the epoch of its eponym, while there is no positive evidence of Chrysostom's authorship. I do not think that Dom P. de Meester has anywhere noticed a certain incoherence or, at least, abruptness of transition, at the *Μεμνημένοι τοῖνυν* and at the opening of the great intercession, which perhaps suggests that the matter has been forced into an alien framework. The second part deals with the sources of the text—MSS, Latin translations, editions, Typika and legislation, and commentaries. And the third part is a careful analysis of the rite and a detailed description and comment on its successive features by way of determining its development; and the result is exhibited finally (after p. 358) in a table. Fr G. Aucher treats of the Armenian version of the Liturgy (p. 359) and with some fragments of another liturgy said to be of S. Chrysostom and translated in the fifth century (p. 398). Fr C. Bacha treats of the Arabic versions, with a text and a translation into French (p. 405). It may be noted that the prayer 'Seigneur notre Dieu' (p. 442), as to which it is remarked on p. 469 that it recurs only in the S. Basil of the MS from which Fr Bacha's text is taken, is an Egyptian offertory-prayer (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 124, 148, 543); and the Greek of the last suffrage but one of the great synapte (p. 444) can be recovered from Giorgi's Egyptian fragments: thus ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν χρηζόντων τῆς σῆς Κύριε βοήθειας [καὶ] ἀντιλήψεως δεόμεθά σου; from which it is clear that for 'victoire' should be read 'aide' (the Arabic of the

original text, p. 413, is نصر). Fr C. Charon writes a long and most valuable and interesting essay on the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom in the Melchite Patriarchates, which amounts to something like a complete liturgical history of the Syriac- and Arabic-speaking Orthodox (pp. 473-718). Mr H. W. Codrington prints the text and a Latin translation of the Syriac Presanctified Liturgy of S. Chrysostom (p. 719), and so supplements the papers he contributed to vols. iv and v of this JOURNAL. Dr C. Auner describes the Roumanian versions and editions of the Liturgy (p. 731). Dr A. Baumstark examines anew and exhibits in parallel columns the relations of the Nestorian *Liturgy of Nestorius* to those of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom, and by an elaborate collection of other parallel passages makes it practically possible to restore the Greek, which, according to Abhdisho, was translated into Syriac by Mar Abha, afterwards Catholicus, on his visit to Constantinople in 535. The Anaphora of Nestorius is, in fact, simply a conflate of selected passages from those of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom, with some additions. Fr A. Pétrovski gives a lengthy account of the Slavonic version of the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom; and Dr J. Bocian explains the modifications introduced into the Slavonic text in the Ruthenian Uniat.

The fifth of the *Neuen Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche* edited by Drs Bonwetsch and Seeburg is Herr R. Engdahl's *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der byzantinischen Liturgie* (Berlin 1908), which contains the text of the Liturgies of SS. Basil and Chrysostom, together with a part of Leo of Tuscany's Latin version of the latter, and the text and Latin version of the Ὑψωσις τῆς Παναγίας (i. e. the office of the holy bread eaten after the morning meal in monasteries), all from the Karlsruhe MS E. M. 6 described by Mone in *Lateinische und griechische Messen*. I have not studied the texts in detail, but so far as I have observed they have no specially remarkable characteristics. The editor adds some account of the MS and its history; and on p. 85 gives a useful bibliography of works bearing on the Greek rite in Italy and on the abbey of Casole. The rest of the volume treats of the *Proskomide*—the vesting of the ministers and the preparation of the gifts—describing its form in a large number of MSS and in the commentaries, and so supplying materials to the history of its development. I cannot but think that Herr Engdahl would have been well advised to tabulate representative schemes; and I do not see how any one can profitably make use of his description without tabulating for himself the material which is here supplied.

In *La Divine Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome* (Paris and Rome 1907) Dom Placide de Meester revises and annotates the Greek translation of Dom Em. André, and prints it in parallel with the Greek. It is a charming little book with an attractive ikon of S. Chrysostom from the

Beuron Press for a frontispiece. Its purpose is not scientific but practical.

At the Eucharistic Congress in London in 1908, Dom P. de Puniet read a memoir on certain Greek liturgical fragments of the seventh century, discovered at Balyzeh, south of Assiout, brought to England by Dr Petrie and now in the Bodleian (*Report of the Nineteenth Eucharistic Congress*, London 1909, pp. 367 sqq.); and to the *Revue Bénédictine* Jan. 1909 he contributed a detailed discussion of the text with a facsimile of the papyrus. The text as presented by Dom P. de Puniet consists of two fragments of a prayer or prayers, a short creed almost entire, the latter part of a further prayer, the end of a preface with *sanctus*, *postsanctus*, and institution, quite evidently of the Egyptian rite. Dr T. Schermann in *Der liturgische Papyrus von Dér-Balyzeh* (Harnack-Schmidt *Texte und Untersuchungen* xxxvi 1 b, Leipzig 1910) makes a valuable correction in Dom P. de Puniet's account, as a result of the examination of the structure of the papyrus-leaves, by which he is enabled to restore the fragments to their right order—viz. a prayer of the faithful, the preface, *sanctus*, *postsanctus*, and institution, a prayer for the fruits of communion, and the creed. He points out the correspondence between this order and that of the baptismal mass in the Latin of the *Egyptian Church Order* (Hauler, p. 113), where the short creed is curiously used at the administration of the chalice and the milk (and honey); and he makes some corrections in the reading of the text, and adds to the suggestions already made by the first editor for supplying the lacunae. The chief interest of the document is twofold; first that it has an invocation, in the usual Eastern form, before the institution (πλήρωσον καὶ ἡμᾶς τῆς παρ[ὰ σοῦ] δόξης, [καὶ] καταξίωσον κατα[απ]έμψαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ [ἁ]γίον σου ἐπὶ τὰ κρίσματα ταῦτα [καὶ ποιήσ]ον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα τ[οῦ] κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [τὸ] δὲ π[οτήριον] αἷμα τῆς καινῆς [διαθήκης]); and that it gives the Greek of the old Egyptian baptismal Creed, which in a slightly developed form is still found in the Coptic and Abyssinian baptismal Orders (Denzinger *Rit. Or.* i 198, 223). As to the former it must be noted that it is not so new as it might at first sight appear; Sarapion has in the same place πλήρωσον καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τῆς σῆς μεταλήψεως; and S. Mark, πλήρωσον ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ταύτην τὴν θυσίαν τῆς παρὰ σοῦ εὐλογίας διὰ τῆς ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ παναγίου σου Πνεύματος; so that the new fragment only shews a difference of form, not of essential substance. For the emendation and completion of the text, it may be suggested, that, in the first prayer, . . . σαν τὰ ἔθνη ποῦ σε ν . . . be read [μὴ εἰπάτω]σαν τὰ ἔθνη Ποῦ ἔ[στιν] ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν;]; cp. Ps. lxxviii (lxxix) 10; for ὁ ὦν, [αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς] τοὺς αἰῶνας, adopted by both editors, be read ὁ ὦν [εὐλογητὸς εἰς] τοὺς αἰῶνας; cp. Rom. ix 5; in the Preface, Dr Schermann's ἐξαπ-

τέρρυ]ες τῶ ἐνὶ κ[αὶ εἰ]ξ[απτέρυγες τῶ ἐνὶ] is obviously a slip for εἰς πτέρυγες. The same writer's suggestion (p. 39) that the text belongs to the third century or even the end of the second can scarcely be taken seriously, nor are any of his reasons at all convincing. I see nothing to require a date earlier than the middle of the fourth century at the earliest.

In vol. x of Card. Mai's *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, edited by Fr Cozza-Luzi and published after his death by Fr A. Rocchi of Grotta-Ferrata (Rome 1905), are contained several liturgical documents. (1) Anastasius the Librarian's Latin version of the *Historia mystica* of S. German, which has already been noticed in the JOURNAL (vol. ix p. 250). (2) A *Typikon* of Messina. (3) A *Typikon* of the Monastery of Casole in the Terra d'Otranto. (4) Hymns on S. Basil, on S. Nilus, founder of Grotta-Ferrata, and on SS. Felicius and Terentianus; and hymns by S. Nilus. (5) More interesting, the text of the Liturgy of S. James, after the MS. roll *Vat. graec.* 2282, hitherto unpublished. The MS was noticed by Montfaucon in the *Diarium Italicum* and elsewhere; in 1901 Dr Wobbermin quoted a paragraph from it in his edition of the Prayers of Sarapion (*Texte und Untersuch.* N. F. ii 3 b), and it was described and discussed by Drs Baumstark and Schermann in *Oriens Christianus* 1903. The text belongs to the province of Damascus, and is of the same type as that of the Messina and the Rossano MSS, printed by Swainson (*Greek Liturgies* pp. 215 sqq.), except that its *diaconica* are of the meagrest. Montfaucon assigned the MS to the tenth century: the present editor reproduces a specimen of the handwriting, but declines to commit himself as to its date. The writing is a sloping uncial, akin to Gardthausen's alphabet of 860, and to the specimen of the Uspensky Psalter, of 862, reproduced in Sir E. M. Thompson's *Greek and Latin Palaeography* p. 156: but it may be earlier than these. In any case it is the oldest text of S. James at present known. On other than palaeographical grounds Drs Baumstark and Schermann argue for a date between 670 and 787, and Mr Edm. Bishop has accepted their argument, and more than once called attention to the early date of the text (*J. T. S.* x p. 598; Connolly *Lit. homilies of Narsai* p. 119). The assigned grounds of this judgement are two: that the opening clauses of the *postsanctus* Ἄγιος εἰ βασιλεὺ τῶν αἰώνων κτλ. are wanting in this text, while they are already quoted by S. John of Damascus (*de Trisag.* 27); and that only six Councils are commemorated. But if Fr Cozza-Luzi's reproduction of the text is anything better than a caricature, the Ἄγιος εἰ is there, securely enough (p. 68); and all the MSS of S. James, of whatever date or *provenance*, which contain the commemoration of the Councils at all, only commemorate six of them; viz. the Messina roll (tenth or eleventh century; Pharan?), Paris *Gr.* 476 (twelfth century; Palestine), *Vat. Gr.* 1970 and *Barberini* vi 10

(twelfth century; Jerusalem?); while only the diptychs of Sinai *Gr.* 1040 (twelfth century; Sinai: cp. *Litt. E. and W.* p. 502) commemorate seven councils. On neither ground, therefore, can the text be claimed as of a date earlier than is required by the palaeographical evidence. Fr Charon in *Χρυσοστομικά* ii p. 491, on liturgical grounds, even assigns it to about 1200; and if it is true, as has been said, that liturgical MSS tend to continue old-fashioned handwritings after they have been abandoned elsewhere, there is a presumption that any such MS is younger rather than older than its palaeographical character might suggest.

The second of Dr Paul Drews's *Studien der Geschichte des Gottesdienstes und des gottesdienstlichen Lebens* is entitled *Untersuchungen über die sogen. clementinische Liturgie im viii. Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen* (Tübingen 1906). In part it revives, in a more persuasive form, the thesis of Probst's *Die Liturgie der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, arguing that the 'ground type' of the Clementine rite is indefinitely old, and is already recognizable in S. Clement of Rome, S. Justin, S. Hippolytus, and Novatian, and that it also underlies the existing Roman rite. The essay contains a laborious comparison of the text with the works of Clement, Justin, Hippolytus, and Novatian, and with the Roman canon. The more of this sort of work that is done the better—and it will be none the worse perhaps for having a thesis to maintain—with a view to disentangling the complex relations between the liturgies. Meanwhile, Dr Drews's investigation requires attentive study, and since I have not yet given it the attention it deserves, I hesitate to express any judgement upon it. However, so far I do not find it immediately convincing. I am not sure that Dr Drews has sufficiently stated the conditions of the problem. What is clear is, first, that the Clementine Liturgy is shaped on the Liturgy of Antioch in the latter half of the fourth century; secondly, that the compiler had before him the anaphora of the *Egyptian Church Order*; and thirdly, as it has long seemed to me, and as I think Dr Drews makes plain, there is a real connexion between it and the Roman rite. But we do not know in any detail what was the content of the Syrian anaphora in the fourth century; only, what we can make out from S. Chrysostom's homilies, combined with the existing texts of the anaphora of S. James and that of S. Basil, which is no doubt a recast of the Syrian, seems to shew that it was on the structural lines of the Clementine; notice even the persistent transition *οὐ παρείδες, οὐ γὰρ ἀπεστράφης* or the like (*Litt. E. & W.* pp. 19, 51, 325; cp. 479, 522). But on the other hand we know a good deal about the literary habits and style of the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and his use of the literature of the past: that he freely reshaped, reduced, or expanded his documents at pleasure, and interpolated them freely from other sources or out of his own head; and that his liturgy, like his Creed and

Gloria in excelsis, is saturated with his own style. Hence it is very precarious to use his text as Dr Drews has used it. To take a simple instance: he has Ἐαυτοῦς τῷ μόνῳ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ παράθεσθε; and Dr Drews quotes S. Justin *Ap.* i 49 τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἑαυτοῦς ἀνέθηκαν (cp. *ib.* 14, 25), and concludes that Justin is referring to the Liturgy as it existed in his own day and is reproduced in the Clementine. But then we know with some certainty what the compiler had before him in the contemporary liturgy of Antioch, viz. Ἐαυτοῦς τῷ ζῶντι Θεῷ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ αὐτοῦ παράθεσθε (S. Chrys. *Hom.* ii in 2 *Cor.* 9); and that ὁ ἀγέννητος Θεός is a favourite expression of his. Hence it would seem to follow, either that he is copying S. Justin, or that the coincidence is accidental. And at present I am disposed to think that throughout the compiler is freely expanding the liturgy of Antioch by quotation from earlier writers and by his own composition, rather than that the coincidences with these writers point to quotation on their part from the groundwork of the Clementine Liturgy. At the same time no doubt the compiler is only expanding his source while retaining the succession of its topics; and I can well believe that the passages Dr Drews quotes from S. Clement and Justin and Novatian do include liturgical reminiscences. And attention may be called to the Jewish precedents for the historical commemorations of the anaphora noticed by Dr Drews on p. 24, note, and to them may be added 3 *Mac.* ii 2-11.

Mr F. C. Conybeare's *Rituale Armenorum* (Oxford 1905), so far as relates to its central text, is a translation of a San Lazzaro MS *Eucho-logion* assigned to the ninth or tenth century, with a marginal apparatus of variants from a number of sources, and in many cases variant forms of the given ceremony printed at length. To this are added, in two appendices, a translation of the Daily Office from a MS of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and the old Armenian Lectionary from two MSS, one of the eighth or ninth century, the other of the fourteenth. And besides this there are given up and down the book a number of illustrative documents and extracts translated from Armenian and Syriac, and some Greek, and occasional discussions. It is satisfactory thus to have the Armenian rites made available, and that from earlier sources and with a wider scope than in the Latin versions of Denzinger's *Ritus orientaliūm*. This only covers the administration of the sacraments, whereas Mr Conybeare's texts include also the consecration of churches and their furniture, the rites of 'animal sacrifice', burial of the dead, consecration of monks, &c., the Epiphany consecration of water, Maundy Thursday observances, and some other things. The Epiphany rite supplements for us the collection of *Blessings of the Waters* edited by Dr Wallis Budge in 1901. As Mr Conybeare points out, what he calls 'animal sacrifice' has been in widespread use in Christendom, origi-

nating, perhaps, in such concessions as that of S. Gregory the Great to the English (Bede *H. E.* i 30), allowing the retention of the material side of the heathen sacrifice, the formal slaying of beasts and distribution of their flesh, while altering its intention ; and the documents quoted by Mr Conybeare and the rites themselves suggest that the Armenian usage includes the application of the same principle to some parts of the levitical system. But it may be questioned whether 'animal sacrifice' does not suggest to us too much. The documents and rites rather suggest that these things are in the ordinary line of the oblations of Christendom generally, the offering of firstfruits and alms, for the use of the clergy and the poor, and that they represent the *agape* (document III, p. 72, by the way, is irrelevant: the sacrifice is evidently the mass). The lessons read (pp. 55, 59), if they include Lev. i 1-13, 2 Sam. vi 17-12, Isa. lvi 6, 7, also include Heb. xiii 10-16, Lk. xiv 12, 13, Acts xxiv 14-18, 1 Pet. iv 6, 7, Lk. xix 1-10; and the New Testament must be held to determine the intention, and to interpret the Old Testament; and the rites consist only of prayers, psalms, and lessons at the church door, and apparently the killing of the animal (which is decorated with cotton wool and scarlet, but this is reprobated by Nerses Schnorhali, p. 84); but there is no ritual action or manipulation of the blood. Yet the language of the prayers, that of the Greek forms perhaps more than that of the Armenian, is sometimes over-coloured, and would I conceive scarcely have been at any time tolerated in the West. It may be added that the Greek prayers relating to the Easter lamb are little, if anything, more than graces before meat; while the *agnus assus* of the papal court, which Mr Conybeare mentions (p. 513) as 'still eaten by the Pope' in the twelfth century (see *Ordines Romani* xi, xii), as though it were an ancient usage, which there is no reason to suppose it was, amounts to no more than our own traditional usage of eating lamb or veal at Easter, except that it was used religiously in commemoration of the Last Supper. Among the other rites given by Mr Conybeare is one of Trial by Ordeal (p. 295), as to which the author of the Edjmiadzin catalogue writes that 'it is not accepted by the Holy Armenian Church, but is a barbarous rite translated in ignorance from Latin'. The latter statement at least is true: the rite consists of a Latin proper mass, with an adjuration of the accused before communion and a special form of administration, and psalms and prayers during the heating of the iron and a prayer for the accused before the ordeal; and the Latin can be for the most part restored from the formulæ of ordeal printed by Martène (*de ant. ecl. rit.* III vii ordines 8-10, 14; cp. the *ordo Dunstani archiep. Dorobern.* in Baluze *Capit. reg. franc.* ii 647).

But perhaps the most interesting and important of the documents

contained in this book is the old Lectionary ; for it comes from Jerusalem and represents approximately the rites described in the *Peregrinatio Silviae*, and gives the psalms and lessons to which the pilgrim refers. What significance the holy places mentioned—the Anastasis, Golgotha, the basilica of S. Stephen, and so on—retained in Armenia, does not appear. This document, combined with the *Peregrinatio* and the *Catecheses* of S. Cyril—and the ‘texts’ of S. Cyril’s instructions are incorporated with the lectionary as ‘the canon of them that are going to be baptized’ (p. 518) and ‘lections of the administration of the mystery’ (p. 524)—give us perhaps the completest picture we possess of liturgical observance in the fourth or fifth century. I will only remark on one point. The lectionary gives the twelve Old Testament lessons of the Easter Vigil (p. 522), three of which recur in the corresponding series of the Epiphany Vigil (p. 517). These are closely related to the corresponding Greek and Roman series of fifteen and twelve lessons respectively : that is to say, the Greek series has eight passages in common with Jerusalem, the Roman seven ; and of these, six are also common to the Greek and the Roman, and therefore to all three series. It follows that the origin of the Greek and the Roman selections, as of so much else, is to be found in Jerusalem in the fourth or fifth century.

The documents that Mr Conybeare has put at our disposal are very valuable : but this is all that can be said in praise of the book. He has taken a great deal of trouble with it, but not nearly enough. Every one knows that he is not commonly very careful of his language ; neither is he here. He seems to fling down the first word that comes into his head without stopping to think whether it appropriately represents the sense (‘unending’, p. 125, obviously ‘unfailing’ ; ‘from eternity’, p. 260, which is nonsense ; it evidently = ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ‘since the world began’), or whether it is dignified and worthy of its context (e. g. ‘send off’, p. 162 ; ‘hint’, p. 204), or even whether it is English, and we find such words as ‘emblemmed’, ‘Godhood’, ‘loving-kind’, ‘staffs’, ‘momently’ (= ἐν τάχει, Rom. xvi 20), ‘discarnate’ ; besides such neo-journallese as ‘heaven’s holy kingdom’. And though there may be some etymological connexion between *μύρον* and *μύρρα*, and though the Greek *μύρον* does contain *σμύρνα* among its many ingredients, yet to render *μύρον*, or its Armenian equivalent, throughout by ‘myrrh’ is quite misleading and in fact ridiculous. And some of Mr Conybeare’s renderings are almost unintelligible : e. g. what does ‘confessional testimony’ mean, p. 146 ; or ‘ruling intuition of sense’, p. 237 ; or ‘in respect of the event’, p. 242 ; or ‘his raiment . . . set on a level with the praisegiving of the twelve apostles’, p. 259 ? Nor is his accuracy in transcription to be depended upon : I have noticed e. g. that whereas on p. 394 he has

nating, perhaps, in such concessions as that of S. Gregory the Great to the English (Bede *H. E.* i 30), allowing the retention of the material side of the heathen sacrifice, the formal slaying of beasts and distribution of their flesh, while altering its intention ; and the documents quoted by Mr Conybeare and the rites themselves suggest that the Armenian usage includes the application of the same principle to some parts of the levitical system. But it may be questioned whether 'animal sacrifice' does not suggest to us too much. The documents and rites rather suggest that these things are in the ordinary line of the oblations of Christendom generally, the offering of firstfruits and alms, for the use of the clergy and the poor, and that they represent the *agape* (document III, p. 72, by the way, is irrelevant: the sacrifice is evidently the mass). The lessons read (pp. 55, 59), if they include *Lev.* i 1-13, 2 *Sam.* vi 17-12, *Isa.* lvi 6, 7, also include *Heb.* xiii 10-16, *Lk.* xiv 12, 13, *Acts* xxiv 14-18, 1 *Pet.* iv 6, 7, *Lk.* xix 1-10; and the New Testament must be held to determine the intention, and to interpret the Old Testament; and the rites consist only of prayers, psalms, and lessons at the church door, and apparently the killing of the animal (which is decorated with cotton wool and scarlet, but this is reprobated by Nerses Schnorhali, p. 84); but there is no ritual action or manipulation of the blood. Yet the language of the prayers, that of the Greek forms perhaps more than that of the Armenian, is sometimes over-coloured, and would I conceive scarcely have been at any time tolerated in the West. It may be added that the Greek prayers relating to the Easter lamb are little, if anything, more than graces before meat; while the *agnus assus* of the papal court, which Mr Conybeare mentions (p. 513) as 'still eaten by the Pope' in the twelfth century (see *Ordines Romani* xi, xii), as though it were an ancient usage, which there is no reason to suppose it was, amounts to no more than our own traditional usage of eating lamb or veal at Easter, except that it was used religiously in commemoration of the Last Supper. Among the other rites given by Mr Conybeare is one of Trial by Ordeal (p. 295), as to which the author of the Edjmiadzin catalogue writes that 'it is not accepted by the Holy Armenian Church, but is a barbarous rite translated in ignorance from Latin'. The latter statement at least is true: the rite consists of a Latin proper mass, with an adjuration of the accused before communion and a special form of administration, and psalms and prayers during the heating of the iron and a prayer for the accused before the ordeal; and the Latin can be for the most part restored from the formulae of ordeal printed by Martène (*de ant. eccl. rit.* III vii ordines 8-10, 14; cp. the *ordo Dunstani archiep. Dorobern.* in Baluze *Capit. reg. franc.* ii 647).

But perhaps the most interesting and important of the documents

contained in this book is the old Lectionary ; for it comes from Jerusalem and represents approximately the rites described in the *Peregrinatio Silviae*, and gives the psalms and lessons to which the pilgrim refers. What significance the holy places mentioned—the Anastasis, Golgotha, the basilica of S. Stephen, and so on—retained in Armenia, does not appear. This document, combined with the *Peregrinatio* and the *Catecheses* of S. Cyril—and the ‘texts’ of S. Cyril’s instructions are incorporated with the lectionary as ‘the canon of them that are going to be baptized’ (p. 518) and ‘lections of the administration of the mystery’ (p. 524)—give us perhaps the completest picture we possess of liturgical observance in the fourth or fifth century. I will only remark on one point. The lectionary gives the twelve Old Testament lessons of the Easter Vigil (p. 522), three of which recur in the corresponding series of the Epiphany Vigil (p. 517). These are closely related to the corresponding Greek and Roman series of fifteen and twelve lessons respectively : that is to say, the Greek series has eight passages in common with Jerusalem, the Roman seven ; and of these, six are also common to the Greek and the Roman, and therefore to all three series. It follows that the origin of the Greek and the Roman selections, as of so much else, is to be found in Jerusalem in the fourth or fifth century.

The documents that Mr Conybeare has put at our disposal are very valuable : but this is all that can be said in praise of the book. He has taken a great deal of trouble with it, but not nearly enough. Every one knows that he is not commonly very careful of his language ; neither is he here. He seems to fling down the first word that comes into his head without stopping to think whether it appropriately represents the sense (‘unending’, p. 125, obviously ‘unfailing’ ; ‘from eternity’, p. 260, which is nonsense ; it evidently = ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ‘since the world began’), or whether it is dignified and worthy of its context (e. g. ‘send off’, p. 162 ; ‘hint’, p. 204), or even whether it is English, and we find such words as ‘emblemmed’, ‘Godhood’, ‘loving-kind’, ‘staffs’, ‘momently’ (= ἐν τάχει, Rom. xvi 20), ‘discarnate’ ; besides such neo-journallese as ‘heaven’s holy kingdom’. And though there may be some etymological connexion between μύρον and μύρρα, and though the Greek μύρον does contain σμύρνα among its many ingredients, yet to render μύρον, or its Armenian equivalent, throughout by ‘myrrh’ is quite misleading and in fact ridiculous. And some of Mr Conybeare’s renderings are almost unintelligible : e. g. what does ‘confessional testimony’ mean, p. 146 ; or ‘ruling intuition of sense’, p. 237 ; or ‘in respect of the event’, p. 242 ; or ‘his raiment . . . set on a level with the praisegiving of the twelve apostles’, p. 259 ? Nor is his accuracy in transcription to be depended upon : I have noticed e. g. that whereas on p. 394 he has

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟ ΠΡΟΣΩΡΑΝ ΒΑΠΤΙΖΕΙΝ, his MS reads ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΠΡΟΣ
 ΩΡΑΝ ΒΑΠΤΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΝ, which is noted in the margin as the reading of
 another MS ; and p. 397, whereas he reads ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΣΑΒΒΑ ΤΑ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ
 ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ, the MS has ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΥ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΒΑΠΤΙΣΑΙ. It
 would have been an advantage also if quotations from the Holy Scrip-
 tures had been noted, and then we should not have had 'epitomize
 rightly', p. 232 (2 Tim. ii. 15 *ὀρθοτομεῖν*), 'sprinkle me with thy
 asperges' (Ps. li. 7), nor 'this divine emblem which thou hast provided
 for them that fear thee . . . by the sight of the rainbow' (Ps. lx 4 *ἔδωκας
 τοῖς φοβουμένοις σε σημείωσιν, τοῦ φυγῆν ἀπὸ προσώπου τόξου*) ; or if the
 Armenian really requires these renderings, it might have been made
 clear why it says what it does. When one comes to Mr Conybeare's
 own notes and statements and discussions, it is impossible in any
 reasonable space to convey an impression of them or adequately to
 criticize them : it would be necessary to go through the sections of the
 book page by page and line by line and expound the notes of inter-
 rogation and exclamation and more uncomplimentary remarks one has
 written in the margin, and even then the criticism would be incomplete.
 Of course Mr Conybeare generally has an axe to grind, and he leaves
 the impression that he reaches his conclusions first and has recourse
 to the evidence later ; while since he does not know or understand the
 broad highways of ecclesiastical usage, his interpretations are apt to be
 the superficial and irresponsible deliverances of his own imagination.
 His assertions, like his words, are flung out at random ; there is no sign
 of any patient investigation and interrogation of facts. A hypothesis is
 final ; it requires no verification ; it does not rouse his conscience and
 make him suspicious of what fits too easily into what he wishes to be
 true. He is credulous and can believe anything that tells in favour of
 his desired conclusion. In short, his work betrays no sign of the
 instincts and qualities that one generally associates with the conception
 of a scholar. Life must be very easy if one can so easily believe what
 one wants to, or if one has ingenuity enough sincerely to make the facts
 conformable. I will take two instances of Mr Conybeare's method.
 (1) Certain texts of the Armenian baptismal order contain in the
 scrutiny of the candidate for baptism two questions, 'What dost thou
 ask for?' and 'Dost thou sincerely ask?', with their answers and the
 consequent reply of the minister, 'According to thy faith be it unto
 thee', and a form of baptism which asserts that the subject has 'come
 of his own will into the catechumenate' (p. 105). Mr Conybeare's
 chief MS, of the ninth or tenth century, does not contain this dialogue,
 &c., and he is therefore concerned to defend the date which he
 assigns to the MS (p. xii). His defence is that infant baptism was of
 late introduction into Armenia, that there must have been a strong

party opposed to it in the ninth and tenth centuries. That the Armenian dissenters still reject it and appeal to the questions of the baptismal order as implying that the candidate comes voluntarily to the font ; while the order for the burial of infants is an order for unbaptized infants. Consequently, in order to disarm the opposition, the passage in question was quietly omitted by scribes, just as the corresponding passage is omitted in the Anglican Prayer Book. Now it will be noticed that Mr Conybeare does not say that there *was* a strong opposition to infant baptism at the period in question, but only that there must have been : in other words he has no proof of it ; while as to the order for the burial of infants there is no sign at all in the rite itself that it was meant for unbaptized children, and in fact in one of the MSS which, Mr Conybeare says, ' present the rite in its primitive form as one of interring unbaptized children ' (p. 276), the children are actually called ' fruit of thy holy font ', and are said to ' have been made children through the holy font of holiness ' (pp. 287 sq.); and the characteristic argument on pp. 276 sq. is scarcely decisive. The extraordinary statement about the Book of Common Prayer does not need comment. Yet, however all this may be, the unwary reader will still naturally suppose that there is some good and sufficient reason to believe that the questions, &c., existed in the ninth or tenth century ; whereas on further examination he will discover that they first appear, so far as can be gathered from the evidence supplied by Mr Conybeare, in the fifteenth century (pp. xv, 105), and continue to appear sporadically. The natural inference from this evidence would be that they came into existence at some time between the tenth and the fifteenth century ; and this the more that the parallel questions *Quid petis? Vis baptizari?* and their answers first begin to appear in the West in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. And, indeed, since Latin rites were translated into Armenian at least in the thirteenth century (p. xxvii), it would not be temerarious to suggest that, like some other things in the later Armenian rite (e. g. mitres, and, if I remember aright, crosiers, and apparently the position of the Creed and the last Gospel in the mass), these questions were borrowed from, or suggested by, the Western rite. Anyhow the facts, as Mr Conybeare supplies them, suggest that the form of baptismal scrutiny in question is not a survival of an ancient form, but one deliberately adopted in the middle ages for the ' baptism of such as are of riper years '. But then, Mr Conybeare has already assumed (*Key of Truth* p. clxxxix) that this form of scrutiny is ancient, and is a survival in the baptism of the orthodox Armenians ' though it has no applicability to children-in-arms ' ; and hence the trouble. (2) Another of Mr Conybeare's favourite assumptions is that the Epiphany is by origin a feast of the Baptism of our Lord interpreted

in the adoptionist sense, and that the commemoration of the Nativity was only attached to it later. Accordingly when he finds an orthodox formula in use at the Epiphany, like the 'hymn', as he calls it, *Σήμερον ἡ χάρις* (p. 417) of the 'Great Consecration' (i. e. the blessing of the waters in commemoration of the Baptism) which treats exclusively of the Baptism, he regards it as 'archaic in tone' and dates it early, and even suggests that it is 'the *debris*' of an adoptionist 'hymn' (pp. 187, 190); and, conversely, when in one form of the 'hymn' he finds references to the Incarnation and the Nativity he interprets them of the Baptism, and makes them mean 'the divine in the Man . . . was actually generated at the Baptism' (pp. 188, 190). In the middle of the book occur some ninety pages of small print containing a translation by the Bishop of Moray of a great part of the Nestorian office and liturgy of the Epiphany from a mediaeval MS. No explanation is given of the presence of this disproportionate and seemingly irrelevant mass of matter: one can only suppose that it is meant to illustrate the close relation of the Epiphany to the Baptism of our Lord. One might have thought that this was already sufficiently familiar. But anyhow what, so far as I know, neither Mr Conybeare nor anybody else has yet proved is that the Epiphany is or ever was in the Church a feast of the Baptism in itself or for its own sake or as having the adoptionist significance which he claims; nor, so far as I have observed, for I have certainly not read them through, do the ninety pages from the Syriac prove or suggest it. As for the *Σήμερον ἡ χάρις*, I fail myself to recognize its 'archaic tone', and should rather have regarded it as not at all archaic. Mr Conybeare rightly points out that the title which seems to assign it to S. Sophronius of Jerusalem (+637) is comparatively modern, and, even if in any sense right, refers only to the prologue **Ἀναξ ἄκτιστε* and not to the *ἕτερος πρόλογος* in which the 'hymn' occurs; only the criticism ought to go further and to point out that the 'hymn' is only intercalated into the prologue, which consists of *Εὐλογητὸς εἶ . . . χορὸς ἁγίων πλησιάζει ἡμῖν μεθ' ὧν εὐχαρίστως βοῶμέν σοι* (pp. 417 sq.), the sense of which is broken by the 'hymn'. The 'hymn' therefore is simply detachable from the rest of the formula. Now it is characteristic of S. John of Damascus (675-760) to compose whole passages of his sermons, or even whole sermons, of rhythmical exclamations or apostrophes all beginning with the same word or words, quite in the manner of the present 'hymn'. Thus *Hom. in Annunc.* (Migne *P. G.* xcvi 649 sq.), *Hom. i, ii in Nat. B. V. M.* (*ib.* 677, 689-696) have pages of clauses beginning with *χαίρε* or *χαίροις*: cp. the eight clauses with *ὦν* *ib.* 648, and the seven with *ὦ θυγάτριον* *ib.* 672: but the favourite form is with *Σήμερον* precisely as in the 'hymn'; see *Hom. in Transfig.* 2, 3 (*ib.* 546), *in Annunc.* (*ib.* 644, 648), *i in Nat. B. V. M.* 3, 4, 7 (*ib.* 664 sqq., 672), *ii in Dormit.* 2 (*ib.*

724), iii in *Dormit.* 2, 4 (*ib.* 753 sq., 757). It seems to me very probable that the 'hymn' in question is simply an extract from a lost sermon of S. John of Damascus on the Epiphany, and that the varieties of text only mean that the clauses selected varied from time to time or from place to place.

Dr A. Baumstark has done a very great service and earned our real gratitude by the publication of his *Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der syrischen Jacobiten* (Paderborn 1910). After a useful and interesting chapter on the Syrian Jacobite Church, he examines and expounds the structure and development of the Divine Office and the ecclesiastical year and its service, in comparison where necessary with those of other rites, and makes clear to the eye the structure and relations of the several services by such tabulations as are found on pp. 119, 135, 137, 141, 147, 155. The Divine Office of all the Eastern rites is now accessible to those of us who are not very familiar with the languages involved: the Coptic in the Marquess of Bute's *Coptic Morning Service*, the Nestorian in Dr Maclean's *East Syrian Daily Offices*, the Armenian in Mr Conybeare's *Rituale Armenorum*, and now the Syrian Jacobite (and I suppose the Maronite is practically identical with it) in Dr Baumstark's work. Dr Baumstark has also published an excellent little manual at the cost of a mark, *Die Messe im Morgenland* (Munich 1906), full of information on the liturgy of all the Eastern rites, its history, parts, and structure.

Dom R. H. Connolly's valuable translation of *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* in *Texts and Studies* (Cambridge 1909) has already been noticed by the Bishop of Moray in this JOURNAL (vol. xi p. 315), and I need not remark on it, except to anticipate with gratitude the promised translation of the work of George of Arbela (p. 75), and to express the hope that he will publish as many of the liturgical commentaries as possible. But I should like to call attention again to Mr Edmund Bishop's Appendix of six 'Observations' on topics suggested by the Homilies, and to make some remarks on some of them. The third Observation is a valuable study of the Diptychs under two heads, that of their contents, and that of their position in the liturgy. As to contents, it is pointed out that, whereas in the West in the earliest period—represented by the synod of Elvira—the names recited were those of the offerers, in the East, where perhaps the practice of recitation of names only began rather later, it was the names of the dead that were recited; and Mr Bishop connects this difference with the early abolition in the East of the offering of the matter of the sacrifice by the people, which was retained in the West down to the middle ages. Later on both East and West combined both living and dead in their diptychs, while in the East at least the lists became only lists of eminent and official

persons, not of mere commonplace people like the Western offerers. As to the position of the diptychs Mr Bishop points out that in Rome the earliest record assumes that the commemoration of names was within the Canon, while in the non-Roman Western rite of the seventh century, as in the Areopagite, Narsai, and the present Nestorian rite, it was outside of and before the Canon. He also argues that at Constantinople always, or at least from the beginning of the sixth century, the diptychs were within the anaphora, as they are now; and suggests that the same was the case at Jerusalem, while for Antioch there is no evidence. Of Egypt he has nothing to say. Much of this does not seem to me quite satisfactory. In order to connect the different contents of the diptychs as between East and West with the offerings of the people, Mr Bishop has to hold that this offering died out in the East in the course of the fourth century. Consequently he criticizes my reconstruction of the rites of Egypt and Cappadocia in *Litt. E. and W.* app. J and N. I am grateful for Mr Bishop's criticism: and I am not sure that even he has fathomed the iniquity of one of my quotations, viz. τὴν πρόθεσιν τῆς δωροφορίας from S. Isidore. It is obvious that I pounced on the phrase without reading the context, in which in fact it means something like 'the motive of almsgiving' and has nothing at all to do with the offertory. But as to the other Egyptian quotation, from S. Cyril in *Zach.* vi, I cannot wholly agree with Mr Bishop. The question is who are the προσάγοντες of the phrase αἱ τῶν προσαγόντων θυσίαι. I interpreted it of the people: Mr Bishop thinks it means the ministers, οἱ θεῖοι ἱερουργοί, mentioned in the context. In the passage Cyril is interpreting Zech. xiv 21, and while he takes 'Jerusalem' to mean the ἱερουργοί, he also makes 'Judah' represent the faithful generally; and 'by none'—i. e. either of ministers or people—are the sacred vessels used for profane purposes, while in them αἱ τῶν προσαγόντων τελοῦνται θυσίαι: each does not bring a vessel of his own, but all use the sacred vessels. It seems to me that it is implied that all the faithful offer, though the functions of ministers and people in respect of the offering are different, and that my interpretation is the more natural. As to Cappadocia, S. Gregory Nazianzen in the passage I have quoted certainly seems to me to mean that Valens intended to offer his oblation in the usual way. To say 'that Valens was an Arian and not in Basil's communion'—and therefore, presumably, could not offer in Basil's church—is naïve: whatever Basil may have thought, Valens intended to be in his communion, or, if you like, to force Basil into his own communion. But however this may be, and possibly Mr Bishop is right, there is still a difficulty: the Eastern rites still retain the petitions for the offerers and for the fulfilment of their intentions in offering; and it is difficult to believe that these were already a mere

survival in the fourth century. And the Greeks at least still offer bread, not now in the mass of the faithful, but naturally before the prothesis. Is this a revival, and not a continuous tradition? With regard to the position of the recitation of the diptychs in the liturgy, Mr Bishop urges that in the Byzantine rite it was always where it is now, within the anaphora and after the consecration. Consequently, again, he criticizes my reconstruction in *Litt. E. and W.* app. P. And, again, I am grateful for the criticism; but Mr Bishop ought not to have said that I seem to have felt considerable confidence in the reconstruction, for, in fact, that is the last thing I felt, as the words which he quotes sufficiently indicate—‘apparently means’, ‘may mean’ (and I wish by the way Mr Bishop would construe S. Maximus’s scholion ὡδε οὐ πρῶτα κτλ.: I am quite uncertain how to do it). Nor is the note quoted the only evidence produced: of course I presupposed the earlier evidence of the preceding appendix—there interpreted with a hesitation for which Dom P. de Meester gently takes me to task (*Χρυσοστομικά* ii p. 334). I think, as I should always have thought, that Mr Bishop is very likely right on this point; only his evidence is not much, if any, more satisfactory than mine. The letter of the patriarch John to Hormisdas in 516 is new to me, and it looks plausible: but one would like to know what is the Greek represented by *in tempore consecrationis*. But what Mr Bishop says of S. Maximus is quite bewildering—that in the *Mystagogia* he comments on the mass only up to the *Sursum corda*, while the exposition of the *Trisagion* (i. e. the *Sanctus*), the Lord’s Prayer, and the *Unus sanctus* has nothing to do with the order of the mass; and since he does not mention the diptychs they cannot have occurred before the anaphora. So far as I can see Maximus comments on the public features of the whole liturgy from the entrance to the communion, i. e. his exposition is from the point of view of the people, and therefore excludes the inaudible parts of the rite, but otherwise it covers the whole in a general way. I do not think this excludes Mr Bishop’s contention because Maximus does not notice everything that is audible even outside the anaphora, but only the prominent features, and I suspect that Mr Bishop is misled by the occasional interest taken in the diptychs for special reasons into supposing that they were very prominent or interesting in normal times. In short it seems to me that the *Mystagogia* is of no use at all for the present purpose. As to the Greek S. James (p. 111), it is true that its diptychs are now within the anaphora; but no doubt this is only a Byzantinism, for in the Jacobite rite the *Liber vite*, when it was in use, was recited before the kiss of peace (*Barsalibi Expositio* 8). The fourth Observation is on diaconal litanies in the mass. Mr Bishop points out that while the Greek S. James and the Byzantine liturgy are crowded with such litanies, none are to be found in the

Syriac Jacobite rite, nor are indicated in S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Silvia, James of Edessa, or Barsalibi, nor yet even in the Greek S. James in its earliest text. And besides, the litanies of the later texts of S. James are not descended directly from the fourth-century litanies of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and S. Chrysostom's homilies. Accordingly Mr Bishop conjectures that the litanic form of prayer originated in the district of Antioch in the fourth century, and thence spread across Asia Minor to Constantinople—while it did not spread to Egypt, S. Syria, or Mesopotamia—and that the litanies now found in the Greek S. James are a late importation from Constantinople. I do not find all this convincing. Obviously, in the first place, there is a distinction to be made, between the litany after the Gospel or Sermon, and the other litanies of the mass. As to the latter, the diaconal litanies which cover the inaudible prayers of the celebrant, it is plain enough that they are of Byzantine origin, and were imported into S. James from Constantinople; and it should be added, that they come not from the present arrangement of the Byzantine liturgy, but from an arrangement more like that represented by the old Latin version of S. Basil, published by Cochlaeus and Cassander or by Goar's Pyromalus MS; and they are an element in the byzantinisation which S. James, like S. Mark, only less completely, has undergone. I venture to doubt whether any conclusion can be drawn from the absence of litanies in Cod. Vat. 2282; texts vary in their intended scope; the celebrant and the deacon each had his own book, and the cues which connected them might be few or many. Besides there are indications of two litanies in the text (pp. 100, 103). But as to the litany after the Gospel, it has every appearance of being identical with the *κοινὰ εὐχαί* of S. Justin Martyr, which must have been some inchoate form of litany in order to be *κοινὰ* at all. However this may be, this litany seems to be universal, and to have existed at some time or other in every rite. Of course it is not indicated in S. Cyril of Jerusalem or Silvia or Narsai, because none of these deals with this part of the liturgy; and no doubt the silence of James of Edessa and of the Areopagite offers a certain difficulty. It has been displaced in the Syriac Jacobite liturgy by another form of prayer, but it existed there once, as is explicitly stated by Barsalibi (*Εχρὸς*. 5) who transliterates *λιτανεία* to describe it: and besides in other offices in which Epistle and Gospel are used, they are commonly followed by a diaconal litany (e.g. baptism, both Jacobite and Maronite, Denzinger *R. O.* i 311, 353; ordination, *ib.* ii 158, 175, 186, 202, &c.). The present Nestorian has its *karuzutha*. In Egypt there are 'The Three' (biddings of the deacon) and the *Προσεύξασθε* with *Κλίνωμεν* and *Ἀναστῶμεν* quite in the form of the Roman *orationes sollemnes*, which are the corresponding Roman feature, now recited only on Good Friday, and at other times repre-

sented by their *incipit* 'Oremus'. And the Gallican had its *preces* at this point; and the African an *indictio orationis communis* by the deacon at some point in the liturgy. In the fifth Observation Mr Bishop discusses 'silent recitals in the mass of the faithful', i. e. the practice of saying the prayers inaudibly on the part of the celebrant. He points out that the old and, one might have thought, obsolete contention that the famous Novel of Justinian was an innovation and aimed at abolishing a traditional use of inaudible prayers, is untenable. But when he adds that the text of the Novel shews that 'the recital of the canon aloud was the . . . still universal practice' throughout Justinian's Eastern Empire, it is very difficult to understand the argument. One would have thought that the Novel indicated that the contrary practice was at least beginning to emerge, and that Justinian would not have shot a gratuitous enactment into the air. Since it is apparently implied by Narsai that the usage was already established in Mesopotamia in the fifth century, Mr Bishop very pertinently suggests that it spread from this source, till it was adopted by Constantinople and Rome, where it is known to have prevailed by the end of the eighth century. It may be added that it was largely prevalent in the intermediate area, Palestine and Syria, by about 600, since John Moschus, in the well-worn story of the Apamean shepherd boys playing at mass, remarks that the children knew the anaphora because 'in certain places the presbyters are accustomed to say it aloud' (*Pratum spirit.* 196). In his sixth Observation, on 'the moment of consecration', among other things, Mr Bishop makes two very valuable contributions to the discussion of the Invocation in the liturgy. First, he points out how the ground has been cleared by two things—by Dr Harnack's proof that the second Pfafrican fragment of Irenaeus is a modern forgery, the result of which is that S. Cyril of Jerusalem is the first witness to the existence of the Invocation and for the conception of consecration by the operation of the Holy Ghost; and by the discovery of the anaphora of Sarapion, which for the first time gives us a formula of Invocation of the Eternal Word. The broad statement on the former point requires such modification as is involved in the substitution of the *Egyptian Church Order* for S. Cyril, since the *Church Order* is probably rather earlier. Secondly, Mr Bishop points out that in the writings occasioned by the Pneumatomachian question, the Catholic writers, while appealing to the operation of the Holy Ghost in baptism and in numberless other spheres, in no case have anything to say of any operation of His in the sphere of the Holy Eucharist, which would be strange if they were accustomed to pray for His presence to consecrate.

The series of *Cambridge Liturgical Handbooks*, under the editorship of Drs Swete and Srawley, opens excellently with the Bishop of Moray's

Ancient Church Orders (Cambridge 1910). Dr Maclean first distributes the Orders into four groups, corresponding to the several elements of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, viz. (1) *Ap. Const.* viii 3-46 with the *Canons of Hippolytus* and the allied documents; (2) *Ap. Const.* vii 1-32 with the *Didache* and the *Apostolic Church Order*; (3) *Ap. Const.* vii 33-viii 2; (4) *Ap. Const.* i-vi and the *Didaskaliae*; and describes their common characteristics, and their relations to one another in respect of contents. He then analyses and compares the contents, under the heads of Church Buildings and Worship, Ordination, Baptism and Confirmation, Doctrine, and the organization of the ecclesiastical year. Under this head more use might have been made with advantage of tabulation, exhibiting the scheme of services in the several orders in parallel columns; and it would be well that the texts compared in parallel columns should really correspond in detail; those on pp. 51, 75 would be perhaps easier to follow if the passages were printed successively, than they are as now arranged. And lastly, the genealogical relations of the orders to one another are described and their several dates determined; and here Dr Maclean takes the view that the members of the first group are not in any direct line of descent one from another, but are co-ordinate developments of a lost original, which may be Hippolytean; and he concludes that the *Canons of Hippolytus* and the Egyptian and the Ethiopic *Church Orders* are Egyptian of the first half of the fourth century, the *Apostolic Constitutions* Syrian of about 375, and that the *Testament of the Lord* belongs to Asia Minor, and about the year 350. It is so long since I gave any serious attention to these documents that I dare not say offhand that I am convinced; but Dr. Maclean's arguments and results very much commend themselves, and I think he has shewn very good reasons as against Dr Funk's rather perverse view, which regards the documents as related to one another in a direct line of descent, but inverts the order and puts *Ap. Const.* viii first, and the *Canons of Hippolytus* last. On p. 50 Dr. Maclean says (as I did myself in *Litt. E. and W.* p. xxxviii top, a passage I should like to delete) that any literary connexion between the anaphora of the *Ethiopic Church Order* (and Hauler's Latin) and that of *Ap. Const.* viii, only begins at Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν. But there are *dissecta membra* of the shorter anaphora floating in the rhetoric of the 'Clementine Liturgy' at an earlier point. Thus:—

Hauler p. 106.

angelum voluntatis tuae qui est
verbum tuum . . . per quem omnia

Litt. E. and W. pp. 15, 19 sq.

ἄγγελον τῆς . . . βουλῆς σου . . .
Λόγον Θεοῦ . . . δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα

fecisti . . . quique in utero [virginis] habitus incarnatus est . . . et virgine natus: qui voluntatem tuam complens . . . cum pateretur ut a passione liberaret eos . . . ut mortem solvat et vincula diaboli dirumpat.

πεποίηκας . . . γέγονεν ἐν μήτρᾳ παρθένου καὶ ἐσαρκώθη, γενόμενος ἐκ παρθένου . . . τὸ θέλημα σου ἐπλήρωσε . . . παθῶν . . . ἵνα πάθους λύση . . . τούτους, καὶ θανάτου . . . καὶ ῥήξη τὰ δεσμὰ τοῦ διαβόλου.

It is evident that the author of *Ap. Const.* had the shorter anaphora before him and expanded it: and this in itself seems almost sufficient to refute Dr Funk's contention. If I may venture to say so, Dr Maclean's work seems to me admirable: full, compact, exact, well arranged, and adequately suited to the purposes of the attractive series which it inaugurates. In a second edition there are a few things which might be amended. P. 36: $\int \alpha \delta \omega$ should surely be rendered 'colonnades', i. e. aisles; and 'apparently near the altar' deleted: the text is 'let the house', i. e. the nave, 'have colonnades': it is an aisled basilica that is described. P. 39: surely the 'prayers and psalmody' belong to the morning office, not to the mass. P. 48 bottom: ἀναφέρειν is used in the second canon of Ancyra of the deacons in relation to the offertory. P. 57 bottom: 'ceased' suggests that Saturday masses had once existed in Rome: but the passage of Socrates quoted rather suggests that they were an innovation elsewhere, which the Roman Church refused (παρητήσαντο) to accept. P. 58: Pionius surely communicated in the species of bread carried home from the altar: and the words quoted from the Hippolytean fragment belong to the catenator, not to his source: they do not occur in the quotation of the passage in Germanus *Historia ecclesiastica*. P. 66: of course no litany is mentioned in Narsai, because he only begins his exposition at a later point. P. 135: surely 'these compilers' *did* 'commemorate the Death and Resurrection of our Lord on the same day' like every one else, viz. at the Paschal vigil. P. 140: surely the τεσσαρακοστή is at the outset definitely the fortieth day before Easter, no doubt the date of the ὀνοματογραφία of the competents, and the observance of the faithful in general gradually and variously adjusted itself to the interval, which came to be called τεσσαρακοστή, as the fifty days after Easter were called πεντηκοστή. P. 161: as to the 'Sanctus', in more than one of the Abyssinian anaphoras it is thrust in anyhow in the middle, without any connexion with the context.

The second volume of this series is the late Bishop of Edinburgh's *Church Year and Kalendar* (Cambridge 1910), which did not receive final revision at the author's hands. After an Introduction on the general lines of the growth of the system and its interest and importance,

and a useful bibliography, Dr Dowden deals with the Week, Martyrs' days, the feasts of our Lord, those of the Blessed Virgin, those of Apostles and other New Testament saints, penitential seasons, Western Kalendars and Martyrologies, the date of Easter, and the Kalendar of the Orthodox Eastern Church; and three appendices deal successively with the Celtic Paschal questions, the Kalendars of the separated Eastern Churches, and the history of the English ecclesiastical Kalendar from the sixteenth century. The book is a useful introduction to the subject, but it is not so satisfactory as Dr Maclean's volume. As will appear from the arrangement of the contents, the treatment is rather descriptive than an attempt to exhibit the development of the system, either historically or logically; and this will be the more evident if it is noticed that the treatment of the Feasts of our Lord begins with Christmas and Epiphany and not with Easter. And one would like to have something more said on the fundamental subject-matter of the great commemorations—that it is not particular events or series of events so much as their significance that is commemorated; or, to put it otherwise, it is the Person of our Lord as interpreted by groups of events that is primary, and the realistic and mimetic is comparatively late and adventitious: so that 1 Tim. iii 16, Tit. ii 11, 12, iii 4-6 may stand for Epiphany, Phil. ii 5-11 for the Pascha, Eph. iv 7-12 for Whitsunday. Dr Maclean has pointed out that the Church Orders imply the commemoration of the Death and Resurrection on the same day (p. 135); and that the Ascension and the Coming of the Holy Ghost were, at least in some cases, celebrated together on Whitsunday (p. 129); and the documents collected by Mr Conybeare are sufficient to shew how significant for the interpretation of the Baptism as commemorated at the Theophania are the Voice and the Dove in relation to the Person of the Lord. Dr Dowden has in part hinted at this (pp. xii, 30, 40); but I cannot but think it needs more emphasis than it commonly receives. The twice-repeated statement (pp. xi, 40), that the commemoration of our Lord's Death is the primitive and essential element in the Pascha, is, to say the least, difficult to understand: while it is curious that Easter is not really treated of at all (pp. 40-42), except in respect of the determination of its date (pp. 104 sqq., 146); and the growth of Lent and its relation to the Paschal fast is not very satisfactorily traced (pp. 79 sqq.). As to some points of detail: p. xiv, All Souls is scarcely a 'festival', and perhaps ought not strictly to be called even a 'day', but rather as in the Roman Kalendar 'commemoratio omnium animarum'; its observance is only additional to the service of the day; p. 8, S. Innocent I' *Ep. ad Decentium* 4 explains the Roman Saturday fast as a weekly reproduction of the Paschal Sabbath, as Friday and Sunday are of those of the Pascha; p. 14, surely the *natale*

of S. Polycarp (Eus. *H. E.* iv 15) should have been mentioned as the earliest recorded martyr's day; p. 28, the name of Mgr Duchesne should be substituted for that of the Bishop of Salisbury (*Origines* p. 253); p. 34 for '(S. James and S. John on Dec.) 26' read '27': p. 40, it is left quite obscure which day Tertullian calls 'dies Paschae': it is in fact Saturday; p. 87, nothing is said of the *origin* of the Ember Days, which was treated of by Dom G. Morin in *Revue Bénédictine* XIV 8 (August 1897).

In his dissertation *The Liturgy of the Primitive Church* (Cambridge 1910), Mr R. M. Woolley, after discussing shortly the mutual relations and the dates of the Church Orders, putting them earlier than does Dr Maclean, discusses the liturgy of the first four centuries in two sections, the 'Proanaphora' and the 'Anaphora', and at the end prints a very useful collection of texts which he has used, accompanied by translations where necessary. As to the first section—and I wish he would not perpetuate the word 'proanaphora', which on all analogy ought to mean, not 'what precedes the anaphora', but 'a previous anaphora'—Mr Woolley derives the mass of the catechumens—lessons, sermon, prayers—from the Synagogue service—(*shema*), prayers, lessons, exposition (cp. Acts xiii 15). I should have thought it was safe only so to derive the group lessons, sermon, and to say merely that the synagogue supplied the form in which 'the teaching of the Apostles' (Acts ii 24) was imparted, since the Christian 'prayers' as we first know them are of quite a different character from those of the synagogue, and are quite differently placed. However this may be, we have the mass of the catechumens in this form in Justin *Ap.* i 67, and with the addition of Psalms, no doubt between the lessons (*Ap. Const.* ii 57), in Tertullian *de anima* 9, as Mr Woolley points out p. 31 (where, however, he should not say that the ψάλτης is mentioned several times in the third century; the order of singers first appears in the canons of Laodicea, and the mention of them in *Ap. Const.* ii 25, iii 11 belongs to the compiler, not to the *Didaskalia*). Mr Woolley then enquires whether the Eucharist was always preceded by this office, and is no doubt right in replying that it was not so under all circumstances; but I question whether he is right in saying that any other service, such as Baptism or Ordination, displaced the 'morning service' altogether (36); for there is a quite sufficient reason for the mass after these rites being described as beginning only at the kiss or the offertory—viz. that baptism or ordination could not be celebrated in the presence of catechumens, and could therefore be inserted into the mass only after the expulsions; not to say that baptisms certainly and ordinations probably normally followed vigils, and the vigil service was itself only a prolonged mass of the catechumens. Mr Woolley also points out that the mass of the catechumens was used alone; only it is not the

remote and obsolete use that one might gather from his pages. It is still the service of Good Friday at Milan ; and also in the Roman rite, though here, since the seventh century, the Adoration of the Cross and the Mass of the Presanctified have followed it ; and the Mozarabic *Indulgentia* of Good Friday is essentially a mass of the catechumens : and see further Duchesne *Origines* pp. 224, 238 (first edition). When Mr Woolley argues from 'Silvia' that the 'morning service' is the origin of the Day Office, this is deplorable. Silvia means precisely what she says, and it is not to be inferred that she implies lessons where she does not mention them p. 40). A simpler form of the sort of offices to which she refers is represented by *Ap. Const.* viii 34-39. Mr Woolley also derives the Mass of the Presanctified from the 'morning service' (p. 41). This I simply do not understand. Of course the Presanctified—is so much as is necessary of the offertory, and a communion—i. e. attached to a mass of the catechumens ; but it in no way springs out of it. And when Mr Woolley says that the oriental Signing of the Chalice is intermediate between the old detached mass of the catechumens and the later Presanctified, I am baffled. The 'Signing of the Chalice' is the Presanctified. I can only conjecture that Mr Woolley supposes that the chalice is reserved for the Presanctified. This, of course, is not so : the chalice is everywhere consecrated by the commixture of the reserved host—except in so far as according to the later Roman interpretation the chalice is not consecrated at all, and the communion is only in one kind. In discussing the anaphora, Mr Woolley distinguishes four types of the *εὐχαριστία*. (1) The type represented by *Didache* 9 sq., and *Acta Joannis* 85, being a developed 'grace before meat', an act of praise and thanksgiving without any detailed commemoration of our Lord's redemptive acts. (2) The type represented by *Acta Thomae* 49 sq., 133 and *Acta Joan.* 109, described as 'an adaptation of the baptismal formula' (p. 54). This is perhaps not a very happy description, since though a Name is invoked or mentioned, it is only in one case the threefold Name (for I think Mr Woolley is mistaken in his interpretation of *Acta Thomae* 50 and the Holy Ghost is addressed throughout, except in the parenthesis 'for Ye are one in all', whatsoever that means ; nor do I at all understand the interpretation of *Acta Joan.* 109, p. 57). The characteristic is rather 'invocation'. (3) The Lord's Prayer, if the notorious passage in S. Gregory the Great has anything behind it. Of course, Mr Woolley does not take this very seriously, since it is quite unsupported. But his account of what S. Gregory did in respect of the Lord's Prayer is strange : viz. that he required the Lord's Prayer to be said by the people and not by the celebrant alone (p. 59 ; cp. p. 61 note), which is precisely what S. Gregory says he had not done ; only Mr Woolley omits the note of interrogation at the end of the passage, and so turns a question into an

assertion. (4) The type that has prevailed with its thanksgiving, recital of the Institution, and ἐπίκλησις. Mr Woolley derives this from the Jewish Paschal ritual; and in a general way, in so far as it involves the solemn commemoration of historical events and the *vere dignum* form of thanksgiving, this may well be true. Some points in this section are not immediately convincing; and it requires thinking about whether the invocation of the Holy Ghost to consecrate can be considered to be a developement of an invocation in a different sense, viz. for the fruits of communion. And there are one or two things that need correction: viz. p. 69 S. Justin does not say that the celebrant *prays* 'that we may be accounted worthy of these things', but that he *gives thanks* that we have been so accounted worthy; and p. 73, when Tertullian says (*de Spectac.* 25) 'ex ore quo *Amen* in Sanctum protuleris', he is not referring to the *Sanctus*; the *Sanctum* is the Holy Thing, the Eucharist, and the reference is to the communion.

The fourth and fifth numbers of Dr P. Drews's *Studien zur Geschichte des Gottesdienstes und des gottesdienstlichen Lebens* (Tübingen 1910) are two *Beiträge zu Luthers liturgischen Reformen*, the one on the Latin and German Litany of 1529, the other on Luther's German Versicles and Collects. Dr Drews examines Luther's attitude towards the Litany from 1529 onwards, and shews that in 1519 and 1520, while deprecating the processions as unprofitable, he has no word of criticism for the Litany itself; that it went out of use in Wittenberg after 1521, probably as a consequence of Kalstadt's measures; and that it was restored, with modifications, in 1529 in view of the Turkish peril. Dr Drews also examines minutely the evidence for the exact date of the publication of the texts, and concludes that the German text appeared shortly before March, and the Latin in August 1529. To determine the sources which Luther employed, Dr Drews has examined the Litanies of the Augustinian, Brandenburg, Erfurt, Magdeburg, Meissen, Merseburg, and Naumburg uses; and he prints the Lutheran texts in parallel columns with those of the Augustinian hermits (the order to which Luther belonged) and of Magdeburg. The result is that so far as Luther's litany is traditional—and except for the omission of the invocations of saints it is entirely traditional in structure and for about half its contents—it reproduces the Augustinian text; and this means that it is simply Roman, since the Augustinian Litany has no special features of its own. Besides this, it has the *In hora mortis* which does not occur in any of these German uses, but is familiar elsewhere—e. g. in England, at Salisbury and Hereford. With the Magdeburg text it shares nothing peculiar, except *Agne* for *Agnus*; the *miserere nobis* with the first two clauses of the *Agnus Dei* and *da [dona] nobis pacem* with the third; and perhaps the structure of one suffrage. On the other hand, it omits fifteen of the petitions of the

Augustinian text, and adds seven new clauses to the deprecations and eighteen to the petitions, for most of which Dr Drews can find no source. To the N.T. sources which he mentions or implies (S. Mt. ix 38, Rom. xvi 20) may be added Pss. cxliv (cxlv) 14, cxlv (cxlvi) 8 for *lapsos erigere*, and 1 Thess. v 14, Heb. ii 18 for *pusillanimes et tentatos consolari et adiuvare*; while a paragraph in the Liturgy of S. Basil (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 408) is more fruitful of parallels than S. Clement 1 Cor. 59 which Dr Drews cites; and *per agoniam*, &c., may rather come from the *Golden Litany* (Maskell *Mon. Rit.* ii p. 248), where the whole suffrage occurs, than from the two sources suggested on p. 42. This Litany is of course of great interest to us, since it contributed a great deal to the Litany in Marshall's *Primer* of 1535, and what is of more importance it is the source of some fourteen suffrages or parts of suffrages, besides incidental words in our own Litany, and has affected Cranmer's treatment of his Latin original and imported some Roman elements in place of the corresponding Sarum matter. Luther's Litany is an excellent piece of work, but it scarcely rivals the brilliancy of Cranmer's achievement. The second of Dr Drews's essays is on the Collects, with their introductory versicles, contained in the *Gesangbücher* of 1533, 1535, and 1543, the German Litany of 1529, the *Deutsche Messe* of 1526, the *Taufbüchlein* of 1523, the *Traubüchlein* of 1529, and the *Ordinationsformular* of 1535. All but some half-dozen of these are translations of Latin originals, which Dr Drews places in parallel with them—among them the *Deus qui contritorum*, from Luther's modification of which and not from the text of the Sarum mass, *in tribulatione cordis*, Cranmer translated the first collect of the English Litany. Dr Drews devotes an appendix to the discussion of the *Almechtiger Ewiger Gott, der du hast durch die sindflutt*, the original of the first collect in the English baptismal order of 1549, which was modified into its present form in 1552. There has been much discussion of this collect, as to whether it was Luther's own composition or a translation. Some lines in the middle and at the end are from the prayer *Deus patrum nostrorum* of the Roman baptisms, which is as old as the *Gelasianum* (i 32); but for the rest no source is known, except in so far as it makes use of what are of course commonplaces in this connexion—our Lord's Baptism, the Flood (1 Pet. iii 20), and the passage of the Red Sea (1 Cor. x 2). Dr Drews argues that the *Deus patrum nostrorum* is itself descended from a longer oriental formula, some form of which he supposes Luther to have had before him. The argument is ingenious and the parallels cited are striking; but the argument is not wholly convincing. Dr Drews's pamphlets are both of them valuable and welcome.

Also much to be welcomed are nos. 36 and 37, and 24 and 25 of the

Bonn *Kleine Texte für theologische und philologische Vorlesungen und Uebungen*; no. 36 containing Luther's *Von Ordnung Gottesdiensts, Taufbüchlein*, and *Formula Missae et Communionis* of 1523, no. 37 the *Deutsche Messe* of 1526, edited by Dr Hans Lietzmann (Bonn 1909), and nos. 24 and 25 Luther's *Geistliche Lieder*, edited by Herr A. Leitzmann (Bonn 1907), which supply critical texts of the most important of the fundamental Lutheran liturgical documents, excellently printed, at the price of a few pence.

In the same series Dr H. Lietzmann edits (1906) the Roman *Ordo missae*, with the mass of Easter day, distinguishing by difference of type, rubrics and text of course, but besides this the parts of priest and people, what is sung from what is said, what is said inaudibly from what is said aloud, what is variable from what is fixed: Dr A. Baumstark edits *die Konstantinopolitanische Messliturgie vor dem ix Jahrhundert* (1909), being the text of the liturgies of SS. Chrysostom and Basil from the Barberini *Euchologion*, with illustrations in the margin from the writings of S. Chrysostom, the liturgy of Nestorius, the *Μυσταγωγία* of S. Maximus, and Anastasius's Latin version of the *Historia mystica* of S. German; and Dr H. Lietzmann again edits *die Klementinische Liturgie* (1910), i. e. the liturgy of *Ap. Const.* viii, with marginal references to S. James, S. Mark, S. Chrysostom, the Roman, *Ap. Const.* ii, and S. Cyril of Jerusalem; along with the anaphora of the Egyptian Church Order from Hauler's Latin, and in German from the Ethiopic; and the anaphora of Sarapion. Dr Paul Maas in *Frühbyzantinische Kirchenpoesie I* (1910) gives fifteen hymns of the fifth and sixth centuries, with elaborate *apparatus criticus*, distributed into three representative classes, by way of introduction to the study of Byzantine hymnology. Dr H. Lietzmann in *Lateinische altkirchliche Poesie* (1910) edits three hymns of S. Hilary, fourteen of S. Ambrose, ten inscriptions of Damasus, seven poems of Prudentius, the *Psalmus c. partem Donati* of S. Augustine, twenty-four selected passages from Commodian, and ten metrical inscriptions, all with critical and illustrative notes on the text. Herr A. Leitzmann edits *Kleinere geistliche Gedichte des xii Jahrhunderts* (1910), a series of six texts in old German, which I cannot understand, while the editor does not explain in any preface or note their significance. Dr D. W. Staerk in *Altjudäische liturgische Gebete* (1910) gives a selection of the prayers of the Synagogue, with introductions and variants: the benedictions of the *Shema*, the *Shemone 'esre* in two recensions, the *Habhinenu* (the occasional substitute for the eighteen benedictions), the *Musaph* prayers (representing the additional sacrifices on sabbaths and certain holy-days), the *Habhdala* of sabbaths and festivals, the sabbath prayers inserted after the third of the eighteen benedictions, and the penitential Litany (*Abhinu malkenu*) of the Day of Atonement

and the preceding days, and the *Kaddish*. The earlier numbers of this series were published co-ordinately in Germany and in England : lately the English editions seem to have ceased. If they are not successful in England, it is to be hoped that they will continue to succeed in Germany.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

(To be continued.)